

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**

LISA MATARAZZO,

Plaintiff,

v.

**EQUIFAX INFORMATION
SERVICES LLC,**

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

**CIVIL ACTION FILE NO.
1:12-cv-01006-WSD-AJB**

ORDER

Currently before the Court is the parties' Joint Motion for Protective Order. [Doc. 49]. The scheduling order in this case states the following:

Therefore, in order to be considered or entered by the Court, any proposed protective/confidentiality order must contain either of the following paragraphs:

Sample language I:

Parties wishing any document filed as part of the record under seal must first present a motion and/or consent order regarding said document to the Court. The Clerk of the Court is not authorized to accept for filing any document designated as sealed without an Order from the Court approving specific documents to be filed under seal.

OR

Sample language II:

Filing Protected Materials in Court. Protected materials may not be filed in Court, whether separately or with or as part of pleadings or other court papers except under seal. Any party wishing to make such a filing must first present a motion regarding the specific documents sought to be filed under seal to the Court for its approval. (Approval of such a motion will be greatly expedited if it is presented with the consent of all parties). Upon approval by the Court the protected materials shall be filed in a sealed envelope or other appropriate container on which shall be endorsed the caption of this lawsuit, the title of the court paper or a brief description of the enclosed materials, the legend “Confidential-Subject to Court Order,” and a statement to the following effect:

This envelope [or other container] contains documents filed in this case by [name of party]; it is not to be opened by, nor are the contents to be displayed or revealed to, anyone other than authorized Court personnel, except upon order of the Court.

[Doc. 45 at 5-6]. The joint motion for protective order filed by the parties does not contain either of these paragraphs. It also appears to missing numerous lines of text. [See, e.g., Doc. 49 at 3, 5, 6]. For these reasons, the consent motion for protective order, [Doc. 49], is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** to the parties’ submission of a corrected proposed consent protective order that also contains the approved language from the scheduling order.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this the 7th day of January, 2013.



ALAN J. BAVERMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE